

Serial No. 10/040,834  
September 2, 2003  
Reply to the Office Action dated April 4, 2003  
Page 5 of 9

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-12 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicants AMEND claims 1-4 and ADD claims 9-12.

The Examiner objected to claims 5-8 for allegedly failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

First, the Examiner is referred to MPEP § 2173.05(f) where the short hand notation used by Applicants in claims 5-8 is explicitly allowed and explained. See also Ex parte Porter, 25 USPQ2d 1144 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1992) and Ex parte Moelands, 4 USPQ2d 1474 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1987).

Second, the Examiner has alleged in paragraph no. 1 on page 2 of the outstanding Office Action that claims 5-8 "are directed to [an] apparatus having no recited structural limitation." This is clearly incorrect. The claims at least require, for example, the structural features of a vibrating gyroscope and an element for performing the temperature-drift adjusting method.

Third, the Examiner has alleged in paragraph no. 1 on page 2 of the outstanding Office Action that claims 5-8 "do not further limit their parent claim, which already include a gyroscope." Claims 5-8 are directed to a gyroscope; claims 1-4 are directed to a temperature-drift adjusting method. Thus, claims 5-8 clearly do not depend upon claims 1-4, respectively, in the sense used in 35 U.S.C. §112, fourth paragraph ("a claim in dependent form shall contain a reference to a claim previously set forth and then specify a further limitation of the subject matter claimed"). As noted above, the references to claims 1-4 in claims 5-8, respectively, are short hand notation used to incorporate the features of claims 1-4 into claims 5-8, respectively. As explained above and in MPEP § 2173.05(f), such shorthand notation in the claims is specifically authorized by the MPEP and is completely acceptable.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claims 5-8.

Claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated

Serial No. 10/040,834  
September 2, 2003  
Reply to the Office Action dated April 4, 2003  
Page 6 of 9

by Ebara et al. (U.S. 5,922,954). Claims 3, 4, 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ebara et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 1, 2, 5 and 6.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

"A temperature-drift adjusting method for a vibrating gyroscope which comprises a vibrator having a detecting terminal for extracting electric charge that is generated due to a Coriolis force; an oscillation circuit for vibrating said vibrator; a variable load impedance connected to the detecting terminal of said vibrator for converting the electric charge into a voltage; and a signal processing circuit for processing a signal output from the detecting terminal of said vibrator and for outputting a signal corresponding to a rotation angular velocity, said method comprising:

**adjusting the impedance value of the variable load impedance in accordance with a temperature drift gradient indicating a change in a voltage output from said signal processing circuit in response to a change in temperature to minimize the temperature drift gradient."** (emphasis added)

Claim 2 has been amended to recite:

"A temperature-drift adjusting method for a vibrating gyroscope which comprises a vibrator having first and second detecting terminals for extracting electric charge that is generated due to a Coriolis force; an oscillation circuit for vibrating said vibrator; first and second variable load impedances connected respectively to the first and second detecting terminals of said vibrator for converting the electric charge extracted by the first and second electrodes into respective voltages; and a signal processing circuit for processing signal outputs from the first and second detecting terminals of said vibrator and for outputting a signal corresponding to a rotation angular velocity, said method comprising:

**adjusting the impedance value of at least one of the first and second variable load impedances in accordance with a temperature drift gradient indicating a change in a voltage output from said signal processing circuit in response to a change in temperature to minimize the temperature drift gradient."** (emphasis added)

Applicants' claim 1 recites the step of "adjusting the impedance value of the variable load impedance in accordance with a temperature drift gradient indicating a

Serial No. 10/040,834

September 2, 2003

Reply to the Office Action dated April 4, 2003

Page 7 of 9

change in a voltage output from said signal processing circuit in response to a change in temperature to minimize the temperature drift gradient." Applicants' claim 2 recites the step of "adjusting the impedance value of at least one of the first and second variable load impedances in accordance with a temperature drift gradient indicating a change in a voltage output from said signal processing circuit in response to a change in temperature to minimize the temperature drift gradient." With the improved features of claims 1 and 2, Applicants have been able to provide a vibrating gyroscope having a simple circuit configuration and a small temperature drift at a low cost (see, for example, the first paragraph on page 5 of the originally filed Specification).

Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite the feature of "variable load impedance" and claim 2 to recite the feature of "first and second variable load impedances." Applicant agrees with the Examiner that Ebara et al. teaches that the relationship between the temperature and the sensitivity change rate can be changed by changing the load impedance of the vibrator.

First, Ebara et al. clearly does **NOT** teach or suggest a step of "adjusting. . ." as recited in Applicants' claims 1 and 2. Ebara et al. does teach **setting** the impedance values of resistors 18a and 18b to be 12  $\Omega$ , 15  $\Omega$ , and 18  $\Omega$  in, for example, the first paragraph of column 5. However, contrary to the Examiner's allegation, Ebara et al. clearly fails to teach or suggest that the **set** values could or should be adjusted.

Second, Ebara et al. teaches the use of **resistors 18a and 18b**, **NOT** the use of a **variable load impedance** as recited in Applicants' claim 1 or the use of **first and second variable load impedances** as recited in Applicants' claim 2. Furthermore, the resistors 18a and 18b are not variable resistors, and thus, there could be no variable load impedance in the device of Ebara et al.

Thus, Ebara et al. clearly fails to teach or suggest the step of "adjusting the impedance value of the variable load impedance in accordance with a temperature drift gradient indicating a change in a voltage output from said signal processing circuit in response to a change in temperature to minimize the temperature drift gradient" as

Serial No. 10/040,834

September 2, 2003

Reply to the Office Action dated April 4, 2003

Page 8 of 9

recited in Applicants' claim 1, and the step of "adjusting the impedance value of at least one of the first and second variable load impedances in accordance with a temperature drift gradient indicating a change in a voltage output from said signal processing circuit in response to a change in temperature to minimize the temperature drift gradient" as recited in Applicants' claim 2.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Ebara et al.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the prior art of record, applied alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the unique combination and arrangement of elements and method steps recited in claims 1 and 2 of the present application. Claims 3-12 depend upon claims 1 and 2 and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that claims 1 and 2 are allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition the Commissioner for a TWO-month extension of time, extending to September 3, 2003, the period for response to the Office Action dated April 3, 2003.

Serial No. 10/040,834  
September 2, 2003  
Reply to the Office Action dated April 4, 2003  
Page 9 of 9

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 2, 2003

  
Attorneys for Applicants

Joseph R. Keating  
Registration No. 37,368

Christopher A. Bennett  
Registration No. 46,710

**KEATING & BENNETT LLP**  
10400 Eaton Place, Suite 312  
Fairfax, VA 22030  
Telephone: (703) 385-5200  
Facsimile: (703) 385-5080